

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Authority to, Among Other Things, Increase Its Authorized Revenues for Electric Service in 2012, and to Reflect That Increase in Rates.

Application 10-11-015
(Filed November 23, 2010)

**GRANTING REQUEST OF EASTERN SIERRA RATEPAYER ASSOCIATION
FOR INTERVENOR COMPENSATION FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS
TO DECISION 12-11-051**

Claimant: Eastern Sierra Ratepayer Association ("ESRA")	For contribution to Decision (D.) 12-11-051
Claimed (\$): \$163,092.66	Awarded (\$): \$138,398.55 (reduced (15.1%))
Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey	Assigned ALJ: Melanie Darling

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision: The decision (D.12-11-051) adopts: 1) base revenue requirements in the test year (TY) 2012 general rate case of Southern California Edison Company (SCE); and 2) revenue requirements for attrition years (AY) 2013 and 2014.

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	1/31/2011	Verified
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI Filed:	2/16/2011	Verified
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		

5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.10-11-015	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	06/03/2011	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?	Yes	
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.10-11-015	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	06/03/2011	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?	Yes	
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision	D.12-11-051	Verified
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	12/10/2012	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	01/18/2013	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?	Yes	

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059

Intervenor’s Contibution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. <u>General</u> . ESRA expended a total of 20.5 professional hours in 2011, and .8 professional hours in 2012, for activities under the category “General”. The activities that fall in this category could not be assigned to any specific substantive issue in the case. These are essential activities that ESRA needed to perform in order to participate in the proceeding. These activities include the following: reviewing ALJ e-mails and rulings; communications with other parties to avoid duplication of participation; review of miscellaneous filing of other parties	The activities in the “General” category are detailed on ESRA’s time and expense records, Attachments 3 and 4.	Yes

<p>including ex parte notices and motions; review of scoping memo; general review of testimony of other parties to avoid duplication; scheduling of witnesses, document exchange with SCE; review of briefs of other parties for coordination purposes. The performance of these essential activities was necessary in order for ESRA to make the specific contributions detailed in 2 through 6 below.</p>		
<p>2. <u>Lundy Conveyance System</u>. ESRA was the only party to address this issue. ESRA submitted testimony and evidence, and conducted cross-examination, challenging SCE's inclusion of \$5 million in its hydro capital forecast for replacement of an existing earthen-lined ditch with a cement conduit and plastic pipeline of much larger capacity. ESRA submitted testimony demonstrating: the project serves no generation purpose and is not related to providing electricity to customers; FERC has not required SCE to construct the project; the existing return ditch is adequate to transport water; SCE does not have rights to the tailrace water that would be conveyed in the proposed pipeline; necessary environmental analyses have not been performed; there is history of local opposition to the project and concern about its potential adverse impact on domestic water supplies; there are questions regarding potential future mingling of ratepayer funds in an escrow account not subject to regulatory oversight. ESRA also challenged the accuracy of SCE's estimate of the total cost of the project in light of the unknown costs of environmental analysis and environmental mitigation.</p> <p>ESRA prevailed on this issue. D.12-11-051 eliminates funding for the project from SCE's forecast.</p>	<p>Exhibit ESRA-1, pp. 5-30; ESRA Opening Brief, pp. 33-64; ESRA Reply Brief, pp. 5-10.</p> <p>The Decision discusses SCE's request and ESRA's arguments at pp. 63-65. The Decision states, "SCE states that it is a FERC-approved conveyance system that SCE is required to construct....This assertion is somewhat misleading." (p. 63); "SCE makes an unsupported claim that the ditch needs to be replaced...SCE has no rights to any of the tailrace water." (pp. 63-64); "...ESRA demonstrated that FERC specifically did not order it to be built." (p. 65); "SCE did not disclose in its application that the settlement agreement also provided for the ratepayer funds to be deposited in an escrow account, along with funds from other signatories. It appears that neither the Commission nor SCE would have control over the escrowed ratepayer funds..." (p. 65); "this project does not appear necessary for safe and reliable delivery of electrical service..."(p.65); "...the proposal is locally controversial and apparently will require an EIR and other local permits..."(p. 65); "SCE presented the Commission with no information about the potential scope and estimated cost of future environmental and legal work." (p. 65); "...the Commission eliminates funding for this project from SCE's forecast..."(p. 65)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>3. <u>Lee Vining Substation</u>. ESRA was the only party to address this issue. ESRA submitted evidence and testimony, and</p>	<p>Exhibit ESRA-1, pp. 31-40 ; ESRA Opening Brief, pp. 70-81; ESRA Reply Brief, pp. 2-5; TR at 2779-2780.</p>	

<p>conducted cross-examination, contesting SCE's request to include this project in its capital forecast. The project was for the relocation of an existing facility to a new location. ESRA presented evidence regarding local concerns about visual impacts; inadequate planning by SCE; unsuitability of location because it is in an avalanche zone and has not been sufficiently studied; safety concerns regarding proposed location; incomplete project planning by SCE; incompatibility of the planned project with the town of Lee Vining which it is intended to serve because upgrade of distribution system has not been planned by SCE.</p> <p>ESRA prevailed on this issue, and funding for this project was eliminated from the capital forecast in this GRC.</p>	<p>Decision, pp. 61-62: "We agree with ESRA that this project is not sufficiently developed for this rate cycle. SCE has not made its final decision on the new location, there is community opposition to the relocation, the local planning and PTC process have not yet begun, it is premature ahead of the upgrade to the town's system, and the avalanche risk may lead to additional construction costs, reliability issues, and rethinking the project. Therefore the Commission finds it reasonable to reduce the capital forecast to eliminate funding at this time."</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4. <u>Eastern Hydro Substation Projects</u>. ESRA was the only party to address this issue. ESRA presented testimony and evidence for disallowance of the capital forecast amounts for the construction of six substations in the Eastern Hydro Division. These six projects are in addition to the Lee Vining Substation project (Item 3 above.) ESRA contended that the projects are not far enough along in the planning and engineering process to include them in the capital forecast in this GRC. ESRA provided testimony about the lack of evidence of any reason these projects need to be performed at this time, as well as evidence that many of the components of these same projects were allowed in SCE's 2009 GRC and not performed.</p> <p>ESRA prevailed on one of five issues in this category. The Decision eliminated funding for one of the six projects addressed by ESRA. ESRA's participation directly led to the elimination of the funding for this one project and a resultant reduction in the capital forecast. While ESRA's participation on the other five projects did not lead to elimination of funding, ESRA's participation required SCE to justify these projects. ESRA</p>	<p>Exhibit ESRA-1, pp. 40-44; ESRA Opening Brief, pp. 64-70; ESRA Reply Brief, pp. 3-5.</p> <p>Decision, pp. 60-61. The Decision concludes that SCE made a reasonable showing of necessity for five of the six substations and allowed forecast expenditures for these projects in the 2012 capital forecast. The Decision adopts ESRA's recommendation for one of the six projects stating "...SCE did not adequately justify the need for the Bridgeport project." The Decision reduces SCE's 2012 capital forecast to reflect elimination of the Bridgeport substation. (Decision, p. 61)</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>believes its efforts in this regard were of benefit to customers and contributed to the Decision by putting SCE on notice that greater transparency in capital requests is needed so that customers can assess the necessity of projects of local interest.</p>		
<p>5. <u>FERC Relicensing</u>. ESRA was the only party to address this issue. ESRA provided testimony and evidence challenging the accuracy of SCE's forecast relicensing costs for six hydroelectric projects. ESRA provided evidence of SCE overestimating FERC relicensing costs in prior GRCs, including evidence that SCE spent only a fraction of the amount it was authorized to spend on relicensing in the 2009 GRC. ESRA proposed a reduction in the capital forecast in this GRC that is an approximate of the amount SCE was authorized to spend in the 2009 GRC, but did not spend on relicensing projects as of 2011.</p> <p>ESRA's participation contributed to the Decision by bringing the issue of overestimating of relicensing expenses to the Commission's attention, resulting in a reduction in SCE's capital forecasts. The Decision adopts a percentage reduction to SCE's capital forecast. ESRA prevailed on its argument that the capital forecasts should be reduced due to evidence of overestimating, and SCE was put on notice by the Commission that it is expected to advance progress on the relicensing efforts.</p>	<p>Exhibit ESRA-1, pp. 49-52; ESRA Opening Brief, pp. 24-33; ESRA Reply Brief p. 10.</p> <p>Decision, pp. 66-67 summarizes ESRA's arguments. The Decision concludes the relicensing projects are likely to be completed by 2014, but expresses concern that funds approved in prior GRCs for FERC relicensing were redirected to over-budget non-relicensing projects at SCE's discretion. The Decision states, "we expect SCE to advance the FERC relicensing projects in this rate case." The Commission further reduced both the 2011 and 2012 capital forecasts by \$4.2 million, approximately 10% of the underspend, to reflect "gross overestimating" by SCE in its prior forecasts.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6. <u>Additional Capital Information</u>. ESRA provided testimony and evidence regarding SCE's failure to spend previously authorized funds on identified projects, and the difficulty in tracking projects from one GRC to another. ESRA also demonstrated the difficulty in determining, from SCE's application and responses to data requests, the status of projects previously authorized, including whether they have been completed and at what cost. ESRA conducted a comparison of forecast hydro capital projects in prior GRCs and those appearing in the current</p>	<p>Exhibit ESRA-1, pp. 44-49; ESRA Opening Brief pp. 10-23; ESRA Reply Brief, p. 10.</p> <p>Decision pp. 67-69. The Decision identifies ESRA's position as "ESRA expressed substantial concerns about SCE's failure to spend previously authorized funds on identified projects and the difficulty in tracking projects from GRC to GRC, sometimes due to merging or renaming of projects." The Decision summarizes evidence presented by ESRA and ESRA's recommendation and states, "We agree that the Commission and the public should be</p>	<p>Yes, but it is difficult to ascertain quantifiable cost savings.</p>

<p>GRC filing, to illustrate the difficulty in tracking the status of projects over time. ESRA recommended that SCE be required in future GRC's to include an exhibit that provides a status update for capital projects for which funding was authorized in the prior GRC, utilizing similar format tables between GRCs for ease of comparison.</p> <p>ESRA's participation contributed to the Decision, which directs SCE to include an exhibit in future rate cases that facilitates Commission and public tracking of specified categories of projects. ESRA's participation contributed to this outcome and is specifically noted in the Decision.</p>	<p>able to track the progress of previously authorized large capital projects. Therefore we have directed in Section 2.5 that SCE include an exhibit in future rate cases that facilitates public tracking of large generation, transmission, and distribution projects authorized in a prior GRC." Decision, p. 69.</p> <p>The Decision at pp. 17-20, Section 2.5, "Transparency," mentions arguments made by ESRA regarding the difficulty of reviewing data provided by SCE. Reference is made to ESRA's complaint that SCE's application was presented in a form which made it difficult to track costs and expenditures from year to year, including what was previously authorized, recorded expenses, and how those expenses were adjusted. (Decision, p. 18.) The Decision requires that going forward SCE provide specified information about progress of previously authorized large capital projects. (Decision, p. 19)</p>	
---	--	--

B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)¹ a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	No	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Other parties addressed aspects of the difficulty of reviewing the data provided by SCE, but did not focus on the difficulty of tracking project cost and expenditure data from year to year, including what was previously authorized and recorded, and how those expenses were adjusted. Decision, p. 18, notes that DRA complained that SCE did not provide data responses in a manner consistent with how it was presented in its testimony, and TURN observed that SCE may make inconsistent forecasts of load growth, demand, and customer growth in other proceedings. This is not the same issue raised by ESRA, whose focus was the format of presentation of information in the application which made it difficult to track costs and expenditures from year to year and between GRCs. (Decision, pp. 18, 67-69.)		Verified

¹ The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill 96 (Budget Act of 2013), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: After reviewing the subject matter of testimony of other parties, ESRA communicated with other parties by telephone and e-mail in order to avoid duplication of issues addressed in testimony, and to develop complementary presentations where suitable. Through coordination efforts, ESRA determined that no other party intended to address the issues addressed by ESRA in its testimony, at hearings, and in briefs. Throughout the proceeding, ESRA reviewed the testimony, motions, and briefs and other filings of all parties in an effort to identify areas where ESRA's efforts might duplicate the efforts of other parties, as well as to identify where ESRA's efforts might be used to supplement or complement that of another party. ESRA's coordination efforts are itemized on ESRA's time records, Attachment 3. Communications with Aglet, TURN, DRA and others are specified in the "Activity" column on Attachment 3, as are general activities (such as reviewing pleadings of other parties) aimed at identifying and reducing possible duplication of effort.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
---	-----------------

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

<p>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p><u>Lundy Conveyance System.</u> ESRA's participation led to the reduction in SCE's capital forecast in the amount of \$4.5 million in 2012, and \$0.025 million in 2011. This amount of savings to customers far exceeds the cost of ESRA's participation on this issue. (Attachments 3 and 4 detail ESRA's total costs of participation, and cost of labor by issue.) In addition to this benefit that can be quantified in dollars, ESRA's participation on this issue provided environmental benefit by preventing the construction of a project the environmental impacts of which have not been fully studied. It also resulted in savings of the costs of potential future environmental and legal work, the estimated cost of which was not provided to the Commission. (Decision, p. 65.)</p> <p><u>Lee Vining Substation.</u> ESRA's participation resulted in a quantifiable savings to customers of \$6.05 million as the result of reduction of SCE's capital forecast to eliminate funding for this project. (Decision, p. 62.) This cost savings to customers far exceeds the cost of ESRA's participation on this issue. (Attachments 3 and 4 detail ESRA's total costs of participation, and cost of labor by issue.) In addition to the quantifiable dollar benefit to customers, ESRA's participation provided the benefit of preventing construction of a substation in an avalanche zone that had not been adequately studied, the safety of which had not been fully analyzed. Further, the avalanche risk could have led to additional unknown construction costs and reliability issues. (Decision, p. 62.)</p> <p><u>Eastern Hydro Substation Projects.</u> ESRA expended less than 7% of its professional hours on this issue. ESRA's participation resulted in a cost savings of \$.05 million due to reduction of the elimination of the Bridgeport substation project from SCE's forecast. (Decision, p. 61.) This cost saving to customers substantially exceeds the cost of ESRA's participation on this issue. (Attachments</p>	<p>CPUC Verified</p> <hr/> <p>Verified</p>
---	---

<p>3 and 4 detail ESRA’s total costs of participation, and cost of labor by issue.) Additionally, customers benefit by ESRA’s participation on this issue because ESRA’s participation on the issue of the planning status of these projects highlighted the importance of SCE providing more transparent information in its application.</p> <p><u>FERC Relicensing.</u> The participation of ESRA on this issue brought to light what the Commission termed “gross overestimating” by SCE in prior forecasts of FERC relicensing costs. It also brought to the Commission’s attention that funds approved in GRCs for FERC relicensing were redirected to over-budget non-relicensing projects at SCE’s discretion, which the Commission stated is of concern. As a result, the Commission directed that it expects SCE to advance these projects in this rate case cycle. (Decision, p. 67.) In addition to bringing these important issues to the Commission’s attention, ESRA’s participation resulted in quantifiable dollar savings to customers. The Commission reduced both the 2011 and 2012 capital forecasts by \$4.2 million. (Decision, p. 67.) This cost benefit far exceeds the cost of ESRA’s participation on this issue. (Attachments 3 and 4 detail ESRA’s total costs of participation, and cost of labor by issue.)</p> <p><u>Additional Capital Information.</u> The benefit of ESRA’s contribution on this issue cannot be quantified in dollars. As discussed in Part II, Box 9, ESRA made a substantial contribution to the Decision, which requires SCE to provide information in future rate cases that facilitates tracking by the Commission and the public of large capital projects. The benefit to the Commission and the public will be some greater transparency in SCE’s managing of capital funds. While it cannot be quantified, this greater transparency may promote increased efficiency and cost savings.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed:</p> <p>ESRA expended a total of 322.8 hours of professional time on this proceeding in 2011-2012. Allocation of this time by issue and activity is shown in Attachments 3 and 4. Given the scope of the GRC, the size of SCE’s application, and the size of SCE’s requested revenue requirement, the amount of time expended by ESRA to participate on five substantive issues is reasonable.</p>	Verified
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue:</p> <p>ESRA participated on five substantive issues. The total of ESRA’s professional time for 2011 and 2012 is 322.8 hours. Allocation of these hours by issue is listed below. Attachments 3 and 4 detail the specific activities performed on each issue.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General 21.3 hours 2. Lundy Conveyance System 90.4 hours 3. Lee Vining Substation 67.4 hours 4. Eastern Hydro Substations 21.6 hours 5. FERC Relicensing 27.5 hours 6. Additional Capital Information 94.6 hours 	Verified

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Kathleen Maloney-Bellomo	2011	317.5	\$467.50	D.10-04-020; D.07-01-009	\$148,431.25	293.8 ^[A]	\$425.00 ²	\$124,865.00
Kathleen Maloney-Bellomo	2012	5.3	\$477.78	D.10-04-020; D.07-01-009; Res. ALJ-281	\$2,532.34	5.3	\$435.00 ³	\$2305.50
	Subtotal:				\$150,963.59	Subtotal:		\$127,170.50
OTHER FEES: **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Kathleen Maloney-Bellomo (Travel)	2011	11.5	\$233.75	D.10-04-020; D.07-01-009	\$2,688.12	11.5	\$212.50	\$2,443.75
Kathleen Maloney-Bellomo (Travel)	2011	15.3	\$233.75	D.10-04-020; D.07-01-009	\$3,576.37	15.3	\$217.50	\$3,327.75
	Subtotal:				\$6,264.49	Subtotal:		\$5771.50
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Kathleen Maloney-Bellomo	2011	4.3	\$233.75	D.10-04-020; D.07-01-009	\$1,005.12	4.3	\$212.50	\$913.75

² Adopted by Decision (D.) 10-04-020.

³ Application of 2.2% Cost-of-Living Adjustment, Resolution ALJ-281.

Kathleen Maloney-Bellomo	2012-2013	14.8	\$238.89	D.10-04-020; D.07-01-009; Res. ALJ-281	\$3,535.57	14.8	\$217.50	\$3,219.00
Subtotal:					\$4,540.69	Subtotal:		\$4,132.75

COSTS

#	Item	Detail	Amount		Amount
1.	Airfare	1/30/11: Mammoth Lakes to SFO to attend PHC	\$132		\$132.00
2.	Vehicle miles	1/30/11: 38 miles @ 51 cents/mile, drive to Mammoth Airport	\$19.38		\$19.38
3.	Hotel	1/30/11: Hotel in SF (Kimpton) to attend PHC	\$239.00		\$239.00
4.	Parking	1/30-31/11: Airport parking at Mammoth Lakes	\$24.00		\$24.00
5.	Vehicle Miles	1/31/11: 38 miles @ 51 cents/mile, return drive from Mammoth airport	\$19.38		\$19.38
6.	Postage	2/17/11 U.S. mail	\$5.65		\$5.65
7.	Photocopies	6/1/11: Copies at Mammoth Business Essentials	\$22.08		\$22.08
8.	FedEx	6/1/11: Shipping cost	\$63.13		\$63.13
9.	Postage	6/6/11: U.S. mail	\$5.10		\$5.10
10	Vehicle miles	8/16/11: 294 miles @51 cents/mile Lee Vining to SF to attend hearings; no summer commercial air service available	\$149.94		\$149.94
11	Hotel	8/16 – 8/18/11: Two nights hotel (Inn at Opera), in SF to attend hearings	\$391.22		\$391.22
12	Photocopies	8/16/11: Copies at Copy Central	\$28.17		\$28.17
13	Parking	8/16 -8/18/11: Two nights hotel parking, in SF to attend hearings	\$57.00		\$57.00
14	Vehicle miles	8/19/11: \$294 miles @ 51 cents/mile SF to Lee Vining, return from hearings; no summer commercial air service available	\$149.94		\$149.94
15	Postage	10/18/11: U.S. mail	\$9.90		\$9.90
16	Postage	1/17/13: U.S. mail (estimated)	\$8.00		\$8.00
Subtotal:			\$1,323.80	Subtotal:	\$1,323.80
TOTAL REQUEST \$:			\$163,092.66	TOTAL AWARD \$:	\$138,398.55

*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Claimant's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees

paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

**Travel and Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA Bar⁴	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Kathleen Maloney-Bellomo (Kathleen Coulter Maloney)	December 01, 1981	99895	No

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Service List
3	ESRA 2011 Time and Expense Record
4	ESRA 2012 & 2013 Time and Expense Record
Comment 1	Cost for office copying waived. Expenses claimed are out-of-pocket, actual costs.

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

#	Reason
A	ESRA substantially contributed on all issues. However, with regards to Issue 6, Additional Capital Information, it is difficult to quantify the savings the Commission will realize due to ESRA's participation. Over one-fourth of the total work hours (94.6 out of 322.8 hours) claimed are attributable to the Additional Capital issue, despite the uncertainty in cost savings. Additionally, 6.2 of these Additional Capital hours, and 14.6 hours overall, were simply spent on coordination to avoid duplication and scheduling. We therefore reduce the hours attributed to Additional Capital Information by one-fourth, a reduction of 23.7 hours.

⁴ This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(2)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Eastern Sierra Ratepayer Association has made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) 12-11-051.
2. The requested hourly rates for Eastern Sierra Ratepayer Association's representative are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$138,398.55.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Eastern Sierra Ratepayer Association is awarded \$138,398.55.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay Eastern Sierra Ratepayer Association the total award. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning April 3, 2013, the 75th day after the filing of Claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1211051		
Proceeding(s):	A1011015		
Author:	ALJ Darling		
Payer(s):	Southern California Edison Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Eastern Sierra Ratepayer Association	01/18/13	\$163,092.66	\$138,398.55	N/A	N/A

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Kathleen	Maloney-Bellomo	Attorney	Eastern Sierra Ratepayer Association	\$467.50	2011	\$425.00
Kathleen	Maloney-Bellomo	Attorney	Eastern Sierra Ratepayer Association	\$477.78	2012	\$435.00

(END OF ATTACHMENT)